

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Chelsea D. Boykin,  
Plaintiff,

v.

Wells Fargo Bank N.A., Timothy J. Sloan,  
Stephen W. Sanger, Elizabeth A. Duke, and  
John D. Baker,  
Defendants.

Case No. 3:18-cv-00599-TLW

**Order**

Plaintiff Chelsea Boykin, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this complaint alleging that Defendants violated several federal employment laws by terminating her without reason while she was on short-term disability leave. ECF No. 1. The matter now comes before the Court for review of a Report and Recommendation (R&R) filed on August 14, 2018, by Magistrate Judge Gossett, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), DSC. ECF No. 25. In the R&R, the Magistrate Judge recommends summarily dismissing the individual defendants under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 because Plaintiff's complaint fails to state a claim against those defendants. *Id.* Objections to the R&R were due August 28, 2018, and Plaintiff has not filed objections. This matter is now ripe for decision.

In reviewing the R&R, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections . . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report

thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

*Wallace v. Hous. Auth. of City of Columbia*, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in *Wallace*, the Court has carefully reviewed the R&R in this case. Noting that Plaintiff filed no objections, the R&R, ECF No. 25, is hereby **ACCEPTED**. Therefore, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, Defendants Timothy J. Sloan, Stephen W. Sanger, Elizabeth A. Duke, and John D. Baker are **DISMISSED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Terry L. Wooten  
Terry L. Wooten  
Chief United States District Judge

October 12, 2018  
Columbia, South Carolina